THE SECOND POST-NEWTONIAN ORDER GENERALIZED KEPLER EQUATION *

LÁSZLÓ Á. GERGELY, ZOLTÁN KERESZTES and BALÁZS MIKÓCZI

Departments of Theoretical and Experimental Physics, University of Szeged, Dóm tér 9, H-6720 Szeged, Hungary

gergely@physx.u-szeged.hu, zkeresztes@titan.physx.u-szeged.hu, mikoczi@titan.physx.u-szeged.hu

arXiv:gr-qc/0612086v1 13 Dec 2006

The radial component of the motion of compact binary systems composed of neutron stars and/or black holes on eccentric orbit is integrated. We consider all type of perturbations that emerge up to second post-Newtonian order. These perturbations are either of relativistic origin or are related to the spin, mass quadrupole and magnetic dipole moments of the binary components. We derive a generalized Kepler equation and investigate its domain of validity, in which it properly describes the radial motion.

Keywords: compact binaries, post-Newtonian expansion, spin, quadrupole moment

Compact binaries composed of neutron stars / black holes are radiating gravitational waves. The waveform and phase of gravitational waves are strongly influenced by the orbital evolution of these systems. Before the system reaches the innermost stable orbit, its evolution can be well described by a post-Newtonian (PN) expansion about the Kepler motion. As dissipative effects due to gravitational radiation only enter at 2.5 PN orders, the orbital evolution is conservative up to the 2PN orders. Even to this order the dynamics is complicated enough not only by the general relativistic corrections to be added at both the first and second PN orders and by tail effects, but by *finite size effects* as well. These include spins, mass quadrupolar and magnetic dipolar moments.

From among these the spin is the dominant characteristic. The effect of the spin-orbit coupling on the motion has been considered long time ago,[1] and revisited more recently.[2–9] This contribution suffers from the non-uniqueness in the definition of the spins, expressed by the existence of at least three different spin supplementary conditions. The physical results however should be independent of the chosen SSC.

The next contributions (at 2PN) are due to spin-spin coupling.[1,3,10–12] These include proper spin-spin contributions between the two components as well as spin self-interactions. An effect of similar size is due to the mass quadrupoles of the binary components. This is the so-called quadrupole-monopole interaction,[1,13,14] representing the effect on the motion of one of the components (seen as a test mass) in the quadrupolar field of the other component. The quadrupole moment may either be a consequence of rotation or it may be not. As magnetars with considerable magnetic field are known, the possibility of the coupling between the

* Research supported by OTKA grants no. T046939, TS044665 and the János Bolyai Fellowships of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences. L.Á.G. wishes to thank the organizers of the 11th Marcel Grossmann Meeting for support.

magnetic dipole moments was also investigated.[15,16] With both components having the magnetic field of 10^{16} Gauss, the magnetic dipolar contribution provides other 2PN contributions to the dynamics.

Although the above enlisted effects emerge either at 1.5 PN (spin-orbit) or at 2PN orders (spin-spin, quadrupole, possibly magnetic dipole), they all represent the leading order contributions of the respective type. In this sense they are linear perturbations of the Keplerian motion. For these perturbations the radial part in the motion of a compact binary system decouples from the angular motion. With the aid of the turning points of the radial motion, given as $\dot{r} = 0$ both a radial period and suitably generalized true and eccentric anomaly parametrizations of the radial motion can be derived.[17,18] The eccentric anomaly parameter ξ agrees with the corresponding parameter u of the Damour-Deruelle formalism.[19] The true anomaly parameter χ however is different from the parameter v. The complex counterparts of these parametrizations have the wonderful property that the overwhelming majority of the radial integrals can be evaluated simply as the residues in the origin of the complex parameter plane.

Employing these convenient parametrizations u and χ, the radial motion could be integrated exactly. The result is a generalized Kepler equation:[20]

$$\begin{aligned} n\left(t-t_0\right) &= \xi - e_t \sin\xi + F\left(\chi;\psi_0,\psi_i\right) \ , \\ F\left(\chi;\psi_0,\psi_i\right) &= f_t \sin\left[\chi + 2\left(\psi_0 - \overline{\psi}\right)\right] + \sum_{i=1}^{2} f_t^i \sin\left[\chi + 2\left(\psi_0 - \psi_i\right)\right] \ , \end{aligned} \qquad (1)$$

where n, e_t, f_t and f_t^i are orbital elements. Most notably, the true anomaly parametrization χ appears only in combination with the coefficients f_t and f_t^i, which in turn receive contributions only from spin-spin, mass quadrupolar and magnetic dipolar contributions. These terms also contain the azimuthal angles ψ_i of the spins (with $2\overline{\psi} = \psi_1 + \psi_2$). The angle ψ_0 is the argument of the periastron (the angle subtended by the periastron and the intersection line of the planes perpendicular to the total and orbital angular momenta, respectively).

Besides the convenient parametrization and integration relying on the use of the residue theorem, the other main ingredient in obtaining the result (1) was the introduction of averaged dynamic quantities $\overline{A}$ and $\overline{L}$. These represent averages of the magnitudes of the Laplace-Runge-Lenz and orbital angular momentum vectors, respectively. The averages are taken over the angular range defined by one radial period. Although the quantities A and L are not constant under the spin-spin, quadrupole and magnetic dipole couplings, their angular average over a radial period remarkably is (as long as we are considering conservative dynamics).

Another important point to stress is that the orbital elements from Eq. (1) depend on the relative angle γ between the spins and the angles $\kappa_{1,2}$ of the spins span with the orbital angular momentum. These in turn evolve, bearing a hidden time-dependence. However, the precessional motion due to the spin-orbit coupling does not affect them, while the error made by disregarding the changes due to the

spin-spin interaction are quite small. To see this we note that the lowest order in which $\kappa_{1,2}$ occur in Eq. (1) are the spin-orbit terms at 1.5 PN. Their change being an 1.5 PN effect,[7] a variation appears only at 3PN accuracy in the Kepler equation. The change in γ is at 1PN,[7] however γ enters only in the spin-spin contributions, its change becoming significant therefore again at 3PN accuracy. These are smaller effects (appearing at 0.5 PN higher order) than those occurring from the leading order radiation reaction. Nevertheless, such changes accumulate over the inspiral. Therefore the Kepler equation (1) with *constant* coefficients should be applied with care. As the magnitude of the still disregarded effects depends on the value of the post-Newtonian parameter $\varepsilon = Gm/c^2r = v^2/c^2$, they are higher during the last stages of the inspiral. In conclusion the Kepler equation with constant coefficients, Eq. (1) represents a better approximation in the early stages of the inspiral.

In order to include the general relativistic 2PN contributions, the 2PN terms[21–24] given in terms of the v-parametrization should be also added to the Kepler equation. Such a Kepler equation represents the complete solution of the radial motion to 2PN orders. We conclude with the remark that a full parametrization of the radial motion up to 2PN orders, with the inclusion of finite-size effects is possible with the ensemble of three radial parameters $(u \equiv \xi,\ v,\ \chi)$.

References

1. B. M. Barker and R. F. O'Connell, Phys. Rev. D **2**, 1428 (1970).
2. L. E. Kidder, C. Will, and A. Wiseman, Phys.Rev. D **47**, 4183 (1993).
3. L. E. Kidder, Phys. Rev. D **52**, 821 (1995).
4. R. Rieth and G. Schäfer, Class. Quantum Grav. **14**, 2357 (1997).
5. L. Á. Gergely, Z. Perjés, and M. Vasúth, Phys. Rev D **57**, 876 (1998).
6. L. Á. Gergely, Z. Perjés, and M. Vasúth, Phys. Rev D **57**, 3423 (1998).
7. L. Á. Gergely, Z. Perjés, and M. Vasúth, Phys. Rev. D **58**, 124001 (1998).
8. G. Faye, L. Blanchet, and A. Buonanno, Phys. Rev. D **74**, 104033 (2006).
9. L. Blanchet, A. Buonanno, and G. Faye, Phys. Rev. D **74**, 104034 (2006).
10. L. Á. Gergely, Phys. Rev. D **61**, 024035 (2000).
11. L. Á. Gergely, Phys. Rev. D **62**, 024007 (2000).
12. B. Mikóczi, M. Vasúth, and L.Á. Gergely, Phys. Rev. **D71**, 124043-1-6 (2005).
13. E. Poisson, Phys.Rev. D **57**, 5287 (1998).
14. L. Á. Gergely and Z. Keresztes, Phys. Rev. D **67**, 024020 (2003).
15. K. Ioka and T. Taniguchi, Asrophys. J. **537**, 327 (2000).
16. M. Vasúth, Z. Keresztes, A. Mihály, and L. Á. Gergely, Phys. Rev. D **68**, 124006 (2003).
17. L.Á. Gergely, Z. Perjés, M. Vasúth, Astrophys. J. Suppl. Series **126**, 79-84 (2000)
18. L. Á. Gergely, Z. Keresztes, and B. Mikóczi, Astrophys. J. Suppl. Series **167**, 286-291 (2006).
19. T. Damour and N. Deruelle, Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré A **43** , 107 (1985).
20. Z. Keresztes, B. Mikóczi, and L.Á. Gergely, Phys. Rev. D **72**, 104022 (2005).
21. T. Damour and G. Schäfer, CR Acad. Sci. *II* **305**, 839, (1987).
22. T. Damour and G. Schäfer, Nuovo Cimento B **101**, 127 (1988).
23. G. Schäfer and N. Wex, Phys. Lett. A **174**, 196, (1993); erratum **177**, 461.
24. N. Wex, Class. Quantum Gr. **12**, 983, (1995).